

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the addition of claims 21 and 22, claims 11 to 22 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note that the "Office Action Summary" does not include an acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and does not indicate whether all certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau. A claim for foreign priority to Application No. 197 54 957.8, filed in the Federal Republic of Germany on December 11, 1997, was made, inter alia, in the "Declaration and Power of Attorney," filed on June 12, 2000. The "Notification of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 CFR 1.494 or 1.495" dated July 18, 2000 indicates that the Office has received priority document.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper, and cited references.

II. Objection to the Specification

As regards the objection to the Specification, the Examiner will note that the title has been amended herein without prejudice as suggested. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 11, and 14 to 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11, and 14 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by "Incorporating LR Parsing Into SPHINX," International Conference on Acoustics, Speech & Signal Processing, April 1991 ("Kita et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not anticipate the present claims for the following reasons.

Claim 11 relates to a method for recognizing speech and recites applying a first recognition procedure to a first segment of a word sequence, the first segment including a plurality of first words. Claim 11 further recites applying a second recognition procedure to a second segment of the word sequence. Claim 11 further recites combining a last two words of the plurality of first words into a

pseudoword upon a change from the first recognition procedure to the second recognition procedure.

Although Kita et al. may discuss a speech recognition method that includes applying two different recognition procedures, Kita et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that last two words of a first segment to which a first recognition procedure is applied is combined into a pseudoword. Rather, Kita et al. state that if the first recognition procedure fails, then a second procedure, which uses a bigram grammar, is applied. Kita et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that the bigram grammar is used for words of the segment to which the first procedure is applied. Nowhere do Kita et al. disclose, or even suggest, combining last two words of a first segment into a pseudoword upon a change to a second recognition procedure. Thus, Kita et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all the limitations of claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not anticipate claim 11.

Claims 14 to 17 ultimately depend from claim 11 and therefore include all the limitations of claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not anticipate these dependent claims for the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

Furthermore, claim 16 recites that the first segment has a predefined length. Claim 17 recites that the second segment has a predefined length. Kita et al. state that the second procedure is used only if and when the first procedure fails. Page 269, right column, last paragraph. Nowhere do Kita et al. disclose, or even suggest, applying a first procedure to a first segment and a second procedure to a second segment, where the first and/or second segment has a predefined length. The Office Action asserts that Kita et al.'s word-pair discloses a segment that has a predefined length. However, the word-pair of Kita et al. is not a segment to which a recognition procedure is applied. Rather, it is the grammar of a recognition procedure applied to a segment of unknown length. The word-pair grammar that specifies which words can follow a particular word is used to recognize the words of the segment of unknown length. For this additional reason it is respectfully submitted that Kita et al. do not anticipate claims 16 and 17.

IV. Rejection of Claims 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by "Statistical Language Modeling Combining N-Gram And Context-Free

Grammars," IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech & Signal Processing, April 1993 ("Meteer et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Meteer et al. do not anticipate the present claims for the following reasons.

Although Meteer et al. may discuss a speech recognition method that includes a combination of two different recognition procedures, Meteer et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that a first recognition procedure is applied to a first segment including a first plurality of words and a second recognition procedure is applied to a second segment including a second plurality of words. Rather, Meteer et al. describe a recognition method in which a single segment of words is processed in a two-step process by a combination of two procedures.

Furthermore, although Meteer et al. may refer to an n-gram model, Meteer et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that **last two words of a first segment** to which a first recognition procedure is applied is combined into a pseudoword for processing using a digram detection method. Thus, Meteer et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all the limitations of claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Meteer et al. do not anticipate claim 11.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 11. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Meteer et al. do not anticipate this dependent claim for the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

V. Rejection of Claims 19 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Kita et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,732,394 ("Nakadai et al."). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kita et al. and Nakadai et al. does not render unpatentable claims 19 and 20 for the following reasons.

Claims 19 and 20 ultimately depend from claim 11 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 11. A set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11, Kita et al. do not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 11, from which claim 19 and 20 ultimately depend. Nakadai et al. are not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the limitations of claim 11 not disclosed or suggested by Kita et al. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Nakadai et al. do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 11 not disclosed or suggested by Kita et

al. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Kita et al. and Nakadai et al. does not render unpatentable claims 19 and 20, which ultimately depend from claim 11. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

VI. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter contained in claims 13 and 18. In this regard, the Examiner will note that claim 13 has been rewritten herein in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 13 is in condition for immediate allowance. Since claim 18 depends from claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is also in condition for immediate allowance.

VII. New Claims 21 and 22

New claims 21 and 22 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 21 and 22 do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification. Since claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

VIII. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 12 2004

By: Richard L. Mayer
Richard L. Mayer (Reg. No. 27, 490)
KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO 26646
Pg. No. 42,194